

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/895,331		07/02/2001	Eiji Satake	010860	6700	
23850	7590	08/01/2003	14			
		STERMAN & HA	EXAMINER			
1725 K STR SUITE 1000) [´]		GORR, RACHEL F			
WASHINGTON, DC 20006				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1711		
				DATE MAILED: 08/01/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<i>7</i> p
م م		Application No.	\bigcap	Applicant(s)	9
		09/895,331	<u> </u>	SATAKE ET AL.	/
Office Action Summary		Examiner		Art Unit	7
<i>A</i>		Rachel F. Gorr		1711	·
 Period for I	Th MAILING DATE of this communication appo Reply	ears on the cover	she t with the co	orr spond nc addi	ess
THE MA - Extension after SIX - If the per - If NO per - Failure to - Any reply	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ALLING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In sof time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is riod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply riod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, a received by the Office later than three months after the mailing atent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, howev within the statutory minir ill apply and will expire S cause the application to	ver, may a reply be tim mum of thirty (30) days IX (6) MONTHS from t become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing date of this com 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.
1) 🖂 🕒 F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 N</u>	1arch 2003 .			
2a) <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	s action is non-fin	al.		
	Since this application is in condition for allowa				merits is
Disposition	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> of Claims	±x parte Quayle, 1	1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
4)⊠ Cl	aim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are pending in the appl	ication.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6 and 7</u> is/are withdra	wn from consider	ation.		
5)∏ CI	aim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ CI	aim(s) <u>1-3 and 5</u> is/are rejected.				
7)∐ CI	aim(s) is/are objected to.				
	aim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirem	nent.		
Application	Papers				
· _	e specification is objected to by the Examiner				
10) Th	e drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ accep	ted or b)☐ objecte	d to by the Exan	niner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
•	e proposed drawing correction filed on			ved by the Examiner.	
	f approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	-	on.		
12)∐ Th∈	e oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.			
Priority und	ler 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13) 🗌 Ad	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ .	All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
1.	Certified copies of the priority documents	have been receiv	ved.		
2.	Certified copies of the priority documents	have been receiv	ved in Applicatio	on No	
	Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bur the attached detailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17	7.2(a)).		age
_	nowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	·			pplication)
_ a) [The translation of the foreign language prov	/isional applicatio	n has been rece	eived.	rphoduony.
	nowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35	U.S.C. §§ 120	and/or 121.	
Attachment(s)	(0)	🗀			
2) 🔲 Notice of	References Cited (PTO-892) Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) On Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) 🔲 1		(PTO-413) Paper No(s). atent Application (PTO-	

Application/Control Number: 09/895,331

Art Unit: 1711

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voss and Rolando in view of Itabashi and Emmons.
- 3. Voss discloses dry laminate adhesives (see abstract) comprising a water-borne polyurethane resin, a polyisocyanate crosslinker (col. 3, last paragraph), and a thickener (col. 4, line 20). Voss discloses pigments and dispersing agents for pigments (col. 4, lines 21-22). In col.3, line 26, he states that he uses the polyurethane of Rolando. Rolando discloses an OH terminated polyurethane (see examples), which appears to have been prepared the same way and from the same ingredients as the applicant's examples. Voss and Rolando differ from the claims by not specifying the softening temperature and viscosity of the water-borne polyurethane, by not specifying an associative thickener and by not showing the pigment dispersing agent as a resin.
- 4. Emmons discloses polyurethane as associative thickeners (col. 7, lines 36-45), and he teaches that less thickener is needed if associative thickeners are used.
- 5. Itabashi discloses a water dispersible polyurethane pigment dispersing agent (see abstract, col. 2, lines 21-26).
- 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the associative thickeners of Emons in the adhesive of Voss in order to thicken the composition with a small amount of thickener. It would have

Application/Control Number: 09/895,331

Art Unit: 1711

been obvious to use the resin pigment dispersing agent of Itabashi in Voss's adhesive because Itabashi teaches using it for urethane formulations (col. 11, line 27), and Itabashi teaches improved pigment dispersibility (bottom col. 24). The softening temperature and viscosity of Rolando's water-borne polyurethane would be the same because the polyurethane appears to be the same as the applicant's.

- 7. Applicant's arguments filed 6-4-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicants argue that Rolando's softening temperature wouldn't be less than 50 deg. C because he dries at 50-85 deg., and one wouldn't dry above the softening temperature. The examiner argues that one would dry above the softening temperature to insure even film flow. In synthesis example 3, the applicants show a water-borne polyurethane that has too high a softening temperature. But this formulation is different from Rolando's examples. Rolando's examples are more like those of the invention.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachel F. Gorr whose telephone number is 703-308-3608. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon., Tues., Thurs., Fri., from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim Seidleck can be reached on 703-308-2462. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/895,331

Art Unit: 1711

Page 4

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

R.G. July 22, 2003

> RACHEL GORR PRIMARY EXAMINER